

**REMARKS**

This Response addresses the issues raised by the Examiner in the Final Office Action mailed January 27, 2005. Initially, Applicants would like to thank the Examiner for the careful consideration given this case. In view of the above amendments and the following remarks, Applicants feel that all outstanding issues have been addressed and prompt allowance of all remaining claims is respectfully requested.

**§102 Rejections**

In the June 7, 2004 Office Action, the Examiner rejected the existing claims in light of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0005902 to Yuen ("Yuen"). In response to this, Applicants amended the independent claims of the present invention to specifically include two concepts: (1) maintaining the size of the target object through each of the plurality of different camera views or video feeds by controlling the focal length of the various cameras ("means for controlling the focal length of each additional camera such that the size of the moving object of interest is generally equal in each of the master and slave cameras"); and (2) including a control in the user interface to select successive additional camera images to effectuate a partial rotation around the object of interest in the display (while maintaining the size of the object of interest during virtual rotation). See Claim 1. Clearly, neither of these concepts was shown in Yuen.

It is noted that the Examiner correctly indicated that Applicants neglected to amend Claim 7 to distinguish it over Yuen in the same way as the amendments made to both Claims 1 and 11. This oversight was corrected by the above amendment made herein to Claim 7 that is similar to the previous amendments to Claims 1 and 11.

In the present Office Action, the Examiner has now argued that U.S. Patent No. 5,164,827 Paff ("Paff") anticipates the amended claims of the present invention. However, the Examiner almost completely ignores the amended portion of the claims in making his arguments. In fact, Paff is clearly distinguishable and is merely a general purpose security system patent.

#### Paff Reference

As stated above, the first key area of the recent amendments (not addressed by Paff) is adjusting the focal length of the additional (slave) cameras in order to maintain the size of the target object in each of the plurality of additional cameras as these cameras are directed based upon the position of the master video camera. In an attempt to address this limitation, the Examiner points to a brief mention at the end of Paff that:

The slave cameras SD1-SD5, responsive to this information, can then adjust their own zooming states or conditions so that the subject is viewed at approximately the same magnification as with the master camera. In this manner, if the zooming state of the master camera is set to wide angle so that a large group of subjects can be tracked through the premises, the slave cameras will also be set to a wide angle position.

Paff at col. 8, lines 2-10. This section of Paff discusses only a general condition of wide angle or normal zooming function. It does not teach or suggest any aspect of the claimed focal length adjustment which provides output-video quality size maintenance such that the video feeds from the plurality of cameras can be selected sequentially (one-by-one) and the size of the object of interest is maintained. This claimed aspect of the present invention provides a desired visual appeal that cannot be achieved with the security system of Paff, and certainly is not taught or suggested by the same.

More importantly, Paff does not have any disclosure whatsoever about the control in the user interface that allows the selection between successive additional camera images in order to carry out the “virtual” rotation around the target object (either at a single instant in time or sequentially – Claim 4). Specifically, the claimed “user interface” is claimed to include “a control to select successive additional camera images to effectuate a partial rotation around the object of interest in the display such that the size of the object of interest remains generally equal throughout the rotation through successive additional camera images.” See Claim 1. The Examiner, in attempting to create a rejection where no support exists, cites to the following passage of Paff:

The station 11 can be provided with a graphics capability which, based on the coordinate position of a subject, locates an icon (graphical representation) of the subject on a floor plan of the premises 1 that is displayed on the station monitor. This would indicate the location of the subject relative to the floor plan of the premises.

Paff at col. 8, lines 16-22. In other words, the cited portion of Paff is merely directed to a picture of a floor plan (of a store) upon which an icon of a target object may be placed for location purposes. It has absolutely nothing to do with the claimed control in the user interface. It has absolutely nothing to do with creating an output video stream in which the various video feeds are selected, one-by-one, to create a feeling of rotating around the target object. In short, it has absolutely no bearing on this portion of the claims. The Examiner’s citation provides no support for his argument, and should be withdrawn as improper. None of the cited art teaches or suggests this specific user control.

#### Request For Interview


In the event that the Examiner is not persuaded by these arguments, Applicants have included with this Preliminary Amendment a Applicant Initiated

Interview Request Form for the week of August 15-19. If the Examiner persists with his rejection, Applicants would like the opportunity to discuss the prior art and the independent claims of the present invention to more particularly point out the many distinctions of the present claims over the cited art. Moreover, although the claims clearly overcome the Examiner's §103 rejections for all of the reasons stated above, this topic could also be discussed at an interview if required.

The above amendments and accompanying remarks address each and every issue raised by the Examiner in the Office Action form the parent case. Each amendment finds full support throughout the specification as noted above. Applicants believe that all claims of the present invention are now in condition for final allowance. If the Examiner feels that any issues remain outstanding, the Examiner is encouraged to contact Applicant's attorney at the contact information below.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: July 27, 2005

By   
Robert D. Kucler  
Reg. No. 45,908

REED SMITH LLP  
P.O. Box 488  
Pittsburgh, PA 15230-0488  
(412) 288-4598

Attorney for Applicants